

developed by Federal and local stakeholders, which then helped aid the recovery efforts in U.S. and elsewhere. A similar plan is needed for all of the areas affected during this hurricane season.

We must also create a permanent waiver of the Jones Act for diesel and fuel. The latest 10-day waiver by the Trump administration is not nearly enough. The Jones Act needs to be waived for at least a year so that response and rebuilding efforts are not encumbered. I also call for a permanent waiver for diesel and fuel.

I also call for immediate deployment of the USS *Abraham Lincoln* aircraft carrier.

I joined 145 Members of Congress in urging the President to deploy the USS *Abraham Lincoln*.

We need to repair telecommunications and authorize the Army and engineers to repair hospitals.

Madam Speaker, I have four other points that I will later present to you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York will provide a translation of his remarks to the Clerk.

POLITICAL COURTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, the new term of the U.S. Supreme Court begins this week. I was a judge for 7½ years before I came to Congress, so I have great interest in their proceedings. It seems to me that our courts have become far too political over the last many years.

Up until the mid-1930s, most Federal courts seemed to try to stay out of politics and paid great deference to actions by Federal and State legislative bodies as being expressions of the will of the people.

For many years now, though, some Federal judges believe they should have been elected to Congress or to State legislatures. One of many examples involves the drawing of congressional, legislative, and local government voting districts. The word “gerrymandering” came into use in 1812, but it really has only been in very recent years that the Federal courts have become heavily involved in drawing specific lines in so many States.

If the court has a liberal judge, he or she will seemingly go to great lengths to throw out any lines that seem to benefit conservatives.

I was at the U.S. Supreme Court recently to introduce some lawyers from Knoxville. That day, the Court was hearing a challenge to some lines drawn by the Virginia Legislature. This is something that the Federal courts should really stay out of and leave to the State legislatures.

Also, opinions now are much longer than in the first 150 years or so, as some judges seem to believe they know almost everything.

Madam Speaker, what we really need is more judges at all levels who have a little more humility.

Many of the issues that the courts are dealing with involve freedom of religion. Our Founding Fathers came here to this country to get freedom of religion, not freedom from religion.

I think it was very sad that a very intolerant group from Wisconsin went to great lengths to get a Bible verse removed from the Knoxville Police Department. It seems that people who proclaim their tolerance the loudest are some of the most intolerant people in this country today, and aimed primarily at conservative Christians.

In *Zorach v. Clauson*, a 1952 U.S. Supreme Court case, Justice William O. Douglas wrote that the law should not prefer “those who believe in no religion over those who do believe,” and that there is “no constitutional requirement which makes it necessary for government to be hostile to religion and to throw its weight against efforts to widen the effective scope of religious influence.”

Justice Douglas was one of the most liberal Justices who ever served on the U.S. Supreme Court.

It surprises many when I tell them that we open every session of the House and Senate with prayer, that there is a prayer room in the center of the Capitol, and several Bible studies go on in the Capitol each week.

Madam Speaker, on an unrelated topic, because we are dealing with the budget proposals this week, I think it is ironic that the only President in the last 70 or 80 years who has tried to rein in defense spending is the only one who spent his career in the military: President Eisenhower.

I spoke out in every way and voted against most of the major initiatives of the Obama administration, but it was false to say that the military has been depleted.

We spend well over \$700 billion on defense and military construction each year. Last year, we spent \$177.5 billion on new planes, tanks, weapons, and equipment, and similar amounts to that for many years. Most of this equipment does not wear out after just 1 year.

In the book “Ike’s Bluff,” when Eisenhower was told he could not cut defense spending, he replied that if he told every general who reduced his budget that he would get another star, you would have to get out of the way of the rush.

He also said: “Heaven help us if we ever have a President who doesn’t know as much about the military as I do.”

Over 80 percent of those in Congress today have never served in our Armed Forces. I am proud to have been one who was privileged to serve.

Most of the Members of Congress today are afraid to oppose or even question wasteful defense spending for fear of some demagogue calling them unpatriotic or saying they are not sup-

porting the troops. But, Madam Speaker, we need to wake up and realize that there is waste even in the Defense Department.

ENTERPRISE CARRIERS FROM MEXICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, today, there are over 800 so-called enterprise carriers from Mexico operating heavy trucks long distance in the United States.

Now, what is wrong with that?

Well, Mexico doesn’t have any drug or alcohol testing of its commercial drivers. Mexico does not have a centralized database of commercial driver’s licenses and driving offenses, making it difficult, if not impossible, to attract and disqualify drivers who are unsafe and who would be disqualified here in the United States.

In Mexico, truck drivers are pretty much exploited and abused. They don’t even have hours of service rules. Some drivers will drive for 1 or 2 days straight.

In the United States, of course, we have very restrictive rules for safety on hours of service. Those laws, theoretically, apply to the 800 Mexican enterprise carriers operating in the United States.

However, how many hours did that person drive before they got to the border? Was it 24 or 48?

Then they cross over the border and they are limited.

Congress objected and voted multiple times by huge bipartisan majorities on legislation I supported to say: No, we do not want these Mexican trucks ranging about here in the United States until they can prove that they meet the same standards as our truck drivers.

We have had a few offenses. We don’t even put special scrutiny on these enterprise carriers. We have very few inspectors out there. But they have managed to rack up some pretty horrific records on a random basis that raise huge questions about their safety.

□ 1030

They had over 900 violations per driver that cannot read or speak the English language sufficiently to respond to official inquiries, a violation of the law; over 800 violations for brake-related issues—worn brake hoses, defective brakes, et cetera; and hundreds of other violations for tire treads, exhaust leaks, and oil leaks. One company was fined \$40,000.

There is only one way to solve this issue, and that is to modify the NAFTA agreement. Remember, this was authorized. They were given national treatment; that is, Mexico is treated the same as the U.S. They won, in one of those secret tribunals, a huge judgment against the United States.

The Obama administration caved in and allowed the door to be opened to